

Mollie K. Anderson, Director Patrick J. Deluhery, Chief Operating Officer

Date: November 4, 2003 18- Page Document

To: All Vendors

From: Jeanette Chupp, C.P.M., Purchasing Agent III and RFP Issuing Officer Iowa Dept. of Administrative Services, General Services Enterprise Phone 515-281-6288 or E-Mail: Jeanette.Chupp@iowa.gov

RE: Addendum No. 3. to RFP70400S027

IT Consolidation Analysis Project due on or before 3:00 P.M., November 20, 2003

The following questions were received from vendors during this procurement process. Answers to the questions and additional changes/additions/information is provided herein as formal Addendum No. 3. to RFP70400S027.

<u>Change No. 1.</u> RFP Section 2.1, Sub-Section D. is hereby changed to read as follows: All proposals shall be held firm for a minimum of ninety (90) calendar days to allow the evaluation committee to fully evaluate all proposals and to make an award deemed in the best interest of the State of Iowa.

<u>Change No. 2.)</u> RFP Section 3.2 MANDATORY PROJECT RESPONSIBILITIES and REQUIREMENTS, Sub-Section B. Contractor Requirements and Responsibilities:

Paragraph 2. and Paragraph 3. are hereby changed to include the word "validate" in 2 places and read as follows:

- 2. The Consolidation Study must focus on "business requirements" driving the information technology requirements. Using sound/recognized business rules the Contractor must research, <u>validate</u> and analyze the "Baseline Information" provided (3.2.A above) by the State of Iowa EIP Project Team and any other research, analysis or processes necessary to identify and compile the "Major Business Requirements" for the current fiscal year (FY04) July 1, 2003, thru June 30, 2004, and known future requirements of each participating organization by platform, location and method of delivery.
- **3.** Using sound/recognized business rules the Contractor must research, <u>validate</u> and analyze the "Baseline Information" provided (3.2.A above) by the State of Iowa EIP Project Team and any other research, analysis or processes necessary to identify and compile the "Major Customer Requirements" for the current fiscal year (FY04) July 1, 2003, thru June 30, 2004, and known requirements of each participating organization by platform, location and method of delivery for categories of customers identified by the Contractor, such as, but not limited to:
 - a. Specialty (i.e. specialized research, academic or business needs such as medical, health-related, etc.)
 - b. Professional (i.e. professional licensing requirements such as real estate, hunting, etc.)
 - c. General (all other types of customers)

Change No. 3.) RFP Section 3.1 MANDATORY PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS:

Change "Sub-Section G. Cost Proposal NOTE: Provided in a separate sealed package." to read:

G. Cost Proposal. NOTE: Provided in a separate sealed package on Attachment VI. Cost Proposal Response Forms



Mollie K. Anderson, Director Patrick J. Deluhery, Chief Operating Officer

Change No. 4.) RFP Section 4.1 PROPOSAL CONTENTS, Sub-Section H. Revise the first sentence to read as follows:

> H. Itemized response to the following points identified in RFP Section 3.1 MANDATORY PRPOSAL REQUIREMENTS: Each point shall be alphabetically/numerically labeled and include the wording as it appears in Section 3.1 in *italics*, followed by the Vendor's positive statement and explanation as to how their system meets each point in regular (non-italic) typed letters.

Change No. 5.) ADD to RFP Section 3.1 MANDATORY PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS, Sub-Section F. Work Plan, Paragraph 1., Item L., Add Number 3. (on RFP Page 33.) to read:

3. An outline of how interviews with each participating department/agency will be handled, including: in-person or electronically, specific number of the maximum number of minutes/hours allowed for each interview, where the interview will be held (at the agency/department site or what alternate site) and the number of your company's representatives who will be present for each interview. Include a description of the process to be used for validating the IT spreadsheets (Baseline Information) provided by the State.

Change No. 6.) ADD to RFP70400S027: Attachment V. and Attachment VI. (enclosed herein)

Question 1.) In addition to technical infrastructure and IT services consolidation, is the State expecting review of program-specific application consolidation as well? Answer: Yes, but only for major applications which shall be provided in IT spreadsheet materials.

Clarify the areas required by the State for consolidation review.

Data centers and mainframe computing Answer: Yes.

Application servers - e.g., UNIX, NT Answer: Yes.

Distributed computing servers, including fax, print, e-mail servers **Answer: Yes.**

Storage Answer: Yes. Software licenses Answer: Yes. LANs Answer: Yes. WANs Answer: Yes.

Telecommunications Answer: Yes, LAN/CAN(Campus Area Network) are to be reviewed.

Applications Answer: Yes, but only for major applications identified

by the agencies in their IT spreadsheet materials.

Question 2.) How will the State use the results of this study? Answer: The legislature required DAS to perform the study and will use it (if funded) to determine if consolidation is feasible, cost effective, and if economies of scale, increased efficiencies, additional benefits and if consolidation is in the best interest of the State. Is this study a basis for more detailed-level planning once the State approves the recommendations in the study? Answer: We do not know at this point what the final consolidation decision may be in the legislature. Should the Legislature decide in favor of consolidation, we would expect that additional planning and/or refinements to the plan will be required prior to commencement and via "change management" following commencement.



Mollie K. Anderson, Director Patrick J. Deluhery, Chief Operating Officer

Question 3.) The order of precedence language in the RFP implies that the State's RFP takes precedence over the vendor proposal when determining scope. Would there be a process allowing for further scope clarification between the State and the selected vendor, resulting in a final scope of work that would be included as part of the Agreement? Answer: RFP Section 4.3., Sub-Section B. states: "Any proposal response package which fails to meet all mandatory requirements shall be deemed non-compliant." A Change Management process shall be used if it is determined that scope changes and/or other changes are necessary after the contract has been executed. Question 4.) Is information regarding the State's current IT assets, IT spend, # of staff, # of servers, etc. available for our review? Our intent is to determine the complexity of the State's IT infrastructure, services, and staffing environment. Answer: No, this information is not available at this time. We are currently gathering that information and it will be available for use by the successful contractor.

Question 5.) Has the State engaged other consultants in relation to this initiative? If so, could you please provide the names of the consulting firm and respective responsibilities? Answer: Not in the last seven (7) years.

Question 6.) Is the intent of the solicitation to identify qualified vendors and go with the lowest price proposal? Answer: See RFP Sections 4.2 and 4.3 regarding the Proposal Evaluation Process. The RFP indicates the proposal with the most points will be awarded the contract. It appears that 70% of the scoring is attributed to technical response, and 30% to price. It also appears that a vendor could score the most on technical response and lose on price. Could you confirm? Answer: Confirmed.

Question 7.) The RFP document indicates this study is in compliance with a legislative mandate. However, there is no budget appropriation for the study at this point. Could you confirm? Answer: Confirmed. The successful vendor should not commence work or provide any services before the contract is signed and funding secured. Also, could you provide the budget appropriation being requested for the project? Answer: The "all-inclusive", itemized total cost (including all travel, expenses, etc.) proposed by the successful Contractor shall be submitted to the Legislature for budget approval.

Question 8.) My company's policy allows for delegation of signing authority - could you confirm that "officer of the firm" also means persons with delegated signing authority on behalf of the company?

Answer: Confirmed.

Question 9) A disclaimer regarding accuracy of information collected/to be collected by the State is included in the RFP. Since the basis of the study would be input provided by the State, what is the intent behind this disclaimer? Answer: The intent of the disclaimer is to identify that ITE is collecting the IT spreadsheets from information submitted by the agencies. ITE is not verifying the accuracy of the information on the IT spreadsheets submitted by approximately forty $(\overline{40})$ agencies. The successful Contractor must validate the accuracy of the Baseline Information (IT Spreadsheets) and verify the information with the submitting agency via interviews and/or other processes.

Question 10.) Related to question #9, we anticipate changes to information provided by the State that have a material impact on the analysis completed and recommendations made would constitute a scope change. Could the State confirm this would be the case? Answer: Refer to Question 2. above.

Question 11.) The viability of our research and consulting business requires we address contractual requirements pertinent to limitation of liability, use of intellectual capital, and sole ownership of pre-existing intellectual capital and tools used in consulting and benchmarking engagements. Would the State reject a proposal that has these noted exceptions? Answer: No. Refer to RFP Section 4.1, Sub-Section G.

Question 12.) Could you clarify the executive sponsor for the project? Answer: Refer to the "Consolidation Study" Section" of House File 534 which was reprinted in its entirety in Addendum Number One. Also, given the enterprise-wide nature of the project, is there a statewide executive-level steering committee comprised of business and IT leaders who would help champion the project? Answer: A Steering Committee of State of Iowa IT and other Leaders is currently being established.



Mollie K. Anderson, Director Patrick J. Deluhery, Chief Operating Officer

Question 13.) Does the state have a full time project manager/coordinator assigned to this study? **Answer: Yes** Question 14.) Depending on the required scope of the infrastructure consolidation study, my company has a comprehensive set of baseline cost information we recommend for data collection. We anticipate, given the state's description of responsibilities in section 3.2, that all costs attributed to provision of IT infrastructure services would be collected by the state - with my company providing assistance through customization of data collection templates and review/rationalization of data collected. **Answer: Any additional Baseline Information needed, pursuant to RFP Section 1.1, Sub-Section B., was to be identified in the Vendor's Proposal Intent Memo (paragraph d.). Contractors should not anticipate that the State will collect "all costs attributed to the provision of IT infrastructure services". The State acknowledges any request for additional baseline information and shall, pending its availability and required time to obtain, attempt to provide the successful Contractor with the additional baseline information requested.**

Question 15.) Is the term "utilization" objective or subjective in its use? **Answer: Question is not understood.**Question 16.) Can the Baseline Information be obtained before RFP Due Date? **Answer: No, the information will not be available.**

Question 17.) 1.18 allows the state to obtain and use proprietary information without awarding the contract to the vendor. Please elaborate. *Answer: This language is not used in RFP Section 1.18.*

Question 18.). 2.1.D. Cost Proposal shall be held firm indefinitely. Please elaborate. Answer: Refer to Addendum No. 3., Change No. 1. which revises RFP Section 2.1, Sub-Section D. to read as follows: All proposals shall be held firm for a minimum of ninety (90) calendar days to allow the evaluation committee to fully evaluate all proposals and to make an award deemed in the best interest of the State of Iowa.

Question 19.) 2.1.A states a 5% retainage and 3.1.f.1.C. states a 10% retainage...... Which is correct? **Answer: Refer to Addendum No. 1., Change No. 3.**

Question 20.) Does the following statement summarize the MISSION of this project? "To consolidate personnel and systems to eliminate duplicate resources and thereby lower cost and improve the quality of service offered." **Answer: No.**

Question 21.) Does the following statement summarize the VISION of this project? "To provide a simplified, integrated and coordinated technology network throughout the various lowa State Government organizations." *Answer: No.* Question 22.) Will an organizational chart (including users and customers) for the various lowa State Government organizations that will be affected within this proposal be provided? Will a systems map of the technology currently employed by the various organizations within the lowa State Government that will be affected within this proposal, including application (programs) and hardware information be provided? *Answer: The State acknowledges any request for additional baseline information and shall, pending its availability and required time to obtain, attempt to provide the successful contractor with additional baseline information requested.*

Question 23.) Will a systems map of technology currently employed by the various organizations within the lowa State Government that will be affected within this proposal, including application (programs) and hardware information be provided? Answer: The State acknowledges any request for additional baseline information and shall, pending its availability and required time to obtain, attempt to provide the successful contractor with the additional baseline information requested.

Question 24.) Do you have any expectations on the start date for the project? The end date (August 15, 2004) is specified, but the start date is not. Would you expect that the work begin prior to the Legislature's budge approval next spring? Answer: The start date is not specified due to the funding being appropriated by the legislature and the start date is directly related to the funding being provided. Any and all services provided prior to funding approval shall be performed entirely at the Contractor's risk.

Question 25.) Do you have any up-front expectations of the costs of the effort? **Answer: No.**

Question 26.) How many State of lowa employees will be assigned to this project team? Answer: There are six (6) DAS-ITE employees on the project team with one (1) DAS-ITE employee being assigned full-time to the project

Mollie K. Anderson, Director Patrick J. Deluhery, Chief Operating Officer

and about fifteen state employees from various agencies on the project work group with these employees in an advisory capacity and not assigned full-time.

Question 27.) Are there any other initiatives within the State of Iowa or the Department of Administrative Services that would affect the accomplishment of this project? Answer: No.

Question 28.) In your RFP, you state "....funding for the study is dependent on an appropriation from the legislature during the next scheduled session of January through April 2004." If the funding is not appropriated until late in the session, can the date of completion be pushed? Answer: No, See HF 534.

Question 29.) In the RFP, you state "...study is mandatory for the Executive Branch, and optional for the Judicial and Legislative branches..." Have funds been appropriated for the "mandatory" portion of the study? Answer: No Question 30.) The RFP requests a detailed work plan. In order to assist in the development of a detailed work plan. we will require more information surrounding the current data centers and their customers. At a minimum, we would require the following...... a. Hardware and application inventories by data center

- b. Data center staffing / organization charges
- c. Customer list by data center, mapped to applications

Answer: We are unable to provide this information at this time. The State acknowledges any request for additional baseline information and shall, pending its availability and required time to obtain, attempt to provide the successful contractor with the additional baseline information requested.

Question 31.) Please consider extending the period to submit formal questions to a date beyond the mandatory vendors conference. Answer: Refer to RFP Section 1.1., Sub-Section D. Additional questions may be submitted to the State within two (2) working days following the vendors conference.

Question 32.) Baseline information appears to be very thorough, although engagements of this nature tend to hinge almost exclusively on the ability of the assigned Consultants to have adequate and timely access to those stakeholders within an organization who possess the understanding of the various systems and processes. Answer: This point is understood.

Question 33.) The RFP states some government branches do not have to participate in the consolidation review. Is it known who and how many agencies/departments will participate in the review? Answer: Yes. Within the Executive Branch there are approximately forty (40) agencies who must participate. A complete list of the agencies and their main contacts will be made available to the selected consultant.

Question 34.) Reconfirming that the consolidation is for hardware, system software, business applications, and networking. Is this with all state departments or only those that participate? Answer: Personnel consolidation is also to be studied. There will be IT spreadsheet information for all the participating agencies. There will not be any IT information submitted by the Board of Regents. The Judicial Branch and Legislative Branch MAY submit IT spreadsheets, but are not required to do so and may not participate.

Question 35.) In case my company administers a questionnaire (to be filled-in by the department officials) in advance of the face-to-face interviews, will the state provide a coordinator for the same? Answer: Yes. Agencies may NOT have the time or resources to answer the same questions already answered by the IT spreadsheets.

Question 36.) Will the state provide workspace and computers for the vendor while collecting data? Can the data be taken off site to be evaluated and prepared for reporting? Answer: Yes. The state will provide workspace and computers. ITE has planned for four (4) consultants to be on-site. More than that number may present problems. Answer: Some confidential material will be included in the consolidation study material. Vendors must agree to comply with state and federal confidentiality requirements. See RFP Section 2.21. Security of Data, and Section 3.1, Sub-Section D. 4.

Question 37.) Can an electronic copy of the RFP be made available to firms attending the vendors' conference? Answer: The RFP is available electronically in Microsoft Word Format to any Vendor. Contact the RFP Issuing Officer to receive an electronic copy.

Mollie K. Anderson, Director Patrick J. Deluhery, Chief Operating Officer

Question 38.) Did any firm or individual assist the state in preparing the RFP and, if so, will they be prohibited from bidding on this effort? **Answer: No.**

Question 39.) Has a budget been established for the project and what is that amount? **Answer: The "all-inclusive total cost (including all travel, expenses, etc.) proposed by the successful Contractor shall be submitted to the Legislature for budget approval.**

Question 40.) Please describe the levels of cooperation or resistance the consolidation vendor can expect from the affected unions and departments. Answer: The cooperation of all participating agencies should be expected. The main union of state employees, AFSCME, was asked to participate, and a union representative serves on the work group. It is in the best interest of all concerned agencies to participate fully with the consolidation study, as the best possible material must be presented to the legislature. The legislature may consolidate IT services, based on the completed consolidation study.

Question 41.) If work is initiated prior to a final determination of Legislative support and funding for the project and funding is not provided, is there a mechanism to compensate the consolidation vendor for services rendered prior to that decision? Answer: Any and all services provided prior to funding approval shall be performed entirely at the Contractor's risk.

Question 42.) Provide a copy of the House File applicable to RFP Section 3.0. Answer: Refer to Addendum No. 1.

Question 43.) How many agencies currently receive IT Services, either from a central IT organization and/or from a specific agency IT organization? Answer: The State acknowledges any request for additional baseline information and shall, pending its availability and required time to obtain, attempt to provide the successful contractor with the additional baseline information.

Question 44.) How many external customers are there currently? **Answer: Question is too broad in scope.**Question 45.) How many separate and distinct IT organizations currently exist? **Answer: Approximately forty (40)**entities combine to make the Executive Branch. These are the entities that are required to participate in the consolidation study.

Question 46.) Page 35 of the RFP notes that 20 copies of our proposal response are required, while other areas require other numbers of copies. Which is correct? **Answer: The question indicates confusion over the number of copies for the final consolidation study (Final Report) versus the number of copies for the "Official Proposal Response Package".** RFP Section 3.2, Sub-Section B., Paragraph 4. (on page 35) refers only to the "Final Report". Refer to RFP Section 4.0 for the required number of copies of the "Official Proposal Response Package".

Question 47.) If August 15, 2004 is the deadline date for a fully accepted Consolidation Study, how long will it take the State to accept the Study once it is received by the Project Team? *Answer: Refer to RFP Section 3.1, Sub-Section F., Paragraph b. (on page 32).*

Question 48.) What is the make-up/roles of the State's project team? Is this team assigned 100% to the consolidation project? Answer: The project lead is assigned full-time to this project. Other staff members within DAS-ITE are assigned to help with the project. Some agencies have staff that will be involved at various levels for the IT spreadsheet collection and the interviews for business requirements. There is a project work group for the project that helped to write the RFP and design the IT spreadsheets. There will also be a project steering committee.

Question 49.) Do the separate IT organizations currently have service delivery performance metrics? **Answer: Some agencies currently have metrics and some may not.**

Question 50.) It is stated that our cost proposal will not be confidential. Who will have access to it? **Answer: Refer to RFP Section 1.11 Public Records and Request for Confidentiality**



Mollie K. Anderson, Director Patrick J. Deluhery, Chief Operating Officer

Question 51.) How many companies are competing for this project? What specific companies did you invite to bid?

Answer: There are currently 20 Vendors participating in the RFP process. They include:

L-3 Communications, Government Services, Inc. Forrest

Planet Consulting, Div of CSG Systems, Inc.

COEUR Business Group

Net-Integrated Consulting (NIC)

Corporate Renaissance Group

PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP

Software Engineering Services

Forrester Research Rose International Deloitte & Touche LLP Enterprise Mid-America Maryville Technologies Winning Solutions, Inc.

CGI
IBM Corporation
Booz Allen Hamilton
MAXIMUS, Inc.
Gartner, Inc.

QCI, Inc.

CIBER

Question 52.) The scope of this project is huge. We understand the funding is dependant on an appropriation from the legislature but how will they be coming to that number? What is your price expectation for delivery of this project? Answer: The "all-inclusive" itemized total cost (including all travel, expenses, etc.) proposed by the successful Contractor shall be submitted to the Legislature for budget approval.

Question 53.) Will you consider a project that is bid time and materials? Answer: No, we will not consider a proposal of time and materials. Refer to RFP Section 3.1, Sub-Section G.

Question 54.) Can you share with us any of the 'baseline' data that has already been generated? For example, headcount count and costs, existing technology spending and utilization, etc? This will help in scoping out the level of effort needed to generate the requirements document? *Answer: No. Information we currently know is that there are three (3) mainframe data centers, approximately 800 IT-classified positions, approximately 800 servers, and approximately 40 agencies to be analyzed during the consolidation study.*

Question 55.) How much onsite work are you looking for versus offsite work? **Answer: There is no preconceived** notion of how much work should be done off-site versus on-site. That being said, the business requirement interviews with all the agencies need to be detailed and thorough to make the consolidation study as accurate as possible. Remember there are approximately 40 agencies to interview and IT Spreadsheet information to validate.

Question 56.) Can you provide any additional detail on your expectations around the final deliverable and any interim deliverables? Answer: Clarifications, expectations and requirements will be communicated to vendors via formal written Addendum, as necessary and appropriate when available.

Question 57.) Will the awardee from this solicitation be excluded from participating in any subsequent service solicitations? If our response is accepted and the Consolidation Analysis Project is completed, will this prevent us from bidding on follow-up projects related to said Consolidation Analysis Project? **Answer: Vendors may be** permitted to conduct additional "in-scope" work related to said contract. Vendors, partners and vendor subcontractors will be prohibited from performing or bidding on additional services that are a direct result of a recommendation or deliverable from the Consolidation Study.

Question 58.) It is our understanding the Consolidation Analysis Project is an analysis of the impact of consolidation of the full Information Technology Services and Staff, however, in RFP Section 3.2, Sub-Section A., Baseline Information being provided only includes ITE, IWD and DOT. Please provide further clarification on full IT versus these three entities. For example, DHS, Revenue and Finance, etc., utilize ITE Services and Staff but are not listed as part of the Baseline Information being provided. Answer: The consolidation study will be a full analysis of the Executive Branch, and mandatory agencies are to be studied with regards to consolidating IT Services. See Attachment V. ITE, DOT and IWD are the Executive Branch agencies with mainframe data centers. There are three (3) mainframe data centers, approximately 800 IT-classified positions, approximately 800 servers, and approximately 40 agencies to be analyzed during the consolidation study.

Question 59.) Regarding the State not warranting the accuracy of the Baseline Information, how do we make recommendations and conclusions if it is inaccurate, i.e. how do we validate or correct such data? **Answer: The intent of the disclaimer is to identify that ITE is collecting the IT spreadsheets from information submitted by**



Mollie K. Anderson, Director Patrick J. Deluhery, Chief Operating Officer

the agencies. ITE is not verifying the accuracy of the information on the IT spreadsheets submitted by approximately forty agencies. The successful Contractor must validate the accuracy of the Baseline Information (IT Spreadsheets) and verify the information with the submitting agency via interviews and/or processes.

Question 60.) Are the business requirements focused on Data Center Infrastructure requirements necessary to deliver current and planned applications to an agreed to Services Level, and not aimed at identifying new applications? Answer: The business requirement interviews conducted with all the agencies are to guide the various consolidation scenarios. Business and customer requirements are not concerned primarily with IT functions, such as data center infrastructure. The business and customer requirements are concerned with program or government service delivery, not the method of delivering the service. Service Levels should remain constant, improve, or make improvement possible.

Question 61.) What happens if funding is not approved in time to complete the study by the deadline of August 15, 2004? Answer: See text of HF 534 included in Addendum No. 1. This text includes the mandatory completion date for the consolidation study.

Question 62.) How many organizations comprise the scope of business units within this infrastructure? *Answer:* Approximately forty (40) agencies comprise the Executive Branch mandatory participating agencies.

Question 63.) How many core functions, services, activities and products, agencies' external and internal customer services, and external and internal information technology customer services comprise the scope of this infrastructure? Answer: Unknown at this time. The successful Contractor shall determine and document each agencies business requirements during interviews.

Question 64.) Are the current business processes flow mapped out in any form within each organization or between organizations where interdependencies exist? Answer: Unknown at this time.

Question 65.) Is there a formal risk management organization that manages risk in a business fashion or in a technology fashion? Answer: Not consistently throughout the Enterprise.

Question 66.) Is there a formal overall business continuity plan in place today? Answer: No. There are high level plans in place for business continuity prepared by Homeland Security/Emergency Management Division. Most of the information contained in these plans is not detailed to the level of specific state program or service delivery.

Question 67.) Is there a formal overall disaster recovery plan in place today? **Answer: Yes. There are high level** plans in place for disaster recovery prepared by Homeland Security/Emergency Management Division. Most of the information contained in these plans is not detailed to the level of specific state program or service delivery.

Question 68.) Are there formal individual business continuity plans in place today by agency or organization? Are there formal individual disaster recovery plans in place today by agency or organization? Is there a formal management process for updating these plans? Is there a formal overall security management organization subordinate to the risk management organization? Are there formal individual security management organizations sub-ordinate to the risk management organization(s)? Answer: Not consistently throughout the Enterprise.

Question 69.) Will documentation unmentioned in the RFP, yet relevant to the on-going project be made available upon request and subsequent review? Answer: Yes. Note, however, that there are confidentiality issues that guide how much and how detailed of information can be released by agencies. See RFP Section 1.11, Section 2.21, and Section 3.1, Sub-Section D., paragraph 4.

Question 70.) Are we to assume the accuracy of the information provided is pristine and unimpeachable until such time as pieces of information are found to be inaccurate? Answer: No.



Mollie K. Anderson, Director Patrick J. Deluhery, Chief Operating Officer

Question 71.) If pieces of information are found to be inaccurate, will we be able to follow our defined project change request procedure to review the impact to the project and assess the financial consequences? **Answer: No. The consultant shall validate the material during the interview or other relevant process. The state shall not be held responsible for invalid data that was provided.**

Question 72.) Will the organizations or agencies deemed necessary during the on-going project be made available upon request and subsequent review? Answer: Yes, assuming you are referring to access to agency personnel. Based on the current workload of agencies, we will need a detailed schedule of the time commitments. Agencies will need to be able to plan for their involvement with the project.

Question 73.) Will there be a program or project manager identified as the single point of contact, problem resolution point, and escalation management? **Answer: Yes.**

Question 74.) What is the make up of the Enterprise Infrastructure and Personnel (EIP) Assessment project team? Answer: There is a project team within DAS-ITE that is made up of six (6) staff members. The project lead, works on this project full-time. Other staff members within DAS-ITE have lesser degrees of involvement. There is also a work group within the CIO Council that has helped to write the RFP, evaluate proposals and select the successful Consultant. This group is made up of representatives from about twelve (12) different agencies.

Question 75.) What is the make up of the project steering committee? **Answer: It will be a combination of** managers both inside and outside the IT area, employee union representatives, technical advisors and others interested in the project. This committee is currently being formed.

BASELINE INFORMATION itemized on Vendor Intent Memos is listed below:

Answer: The State acknowledges any request for additional baseline information and shall, pending its availability and required time to obtain, attempt to provide the successful contractor with the additional baseline information requested.

- 1. Granular application information will be required beyond a profile
- 2. Granular licensing agreement information will be required beyond a profile
- 3. Application criticality rating information will be required beyond a profile
- 4. Application security rating information will be required beyond a profile
- 5. Baseline details behind personnel counts and costs will be required.
- 6. Baseline details behind technology spending and utilization will be required.
- 7. Baseline details behind occupancy costs will be required.
- 8. Baseline details behind the infrastructure support and facilities issues.
- 9. Existing documentation from formal processes and procedures as it pertains to the infrastructure, security thereof, and recovery thereof will be required.
- 10. Complete organizational charts
- 11. Current work and process flow
- 12. Current "functionality features" of process i.e. according to physical location or otherwise
- 13. Current information technology architecture
- 14. Physical location of hardware
- 15. Facilities Locations
- 16. Current Disaster Recover Plan
- 17. Current Network Map
- 18. Current Budget
- 19. Compatibility Issues (Answer: These will be reported by the consultant in the final consolidation study.)

Mollie K. Anderson, Director Patrick J. Deluhery, Chief Operating Officer

- 20. Current Legacy Systems
- 21. Application Inventory
- 22. Additional Baseline Information requested by vendors
- 23. Organizational charges for all three data centers
- 24. Organization charts for departments with enterprise servers in addition to the three data centers, specifically showing any IT personnel associated with the enterprise servers.
- 25. Job descriptions for all personnel in the three data centers and any information technology personnel in other departments throughout the state.
- 26. An inventory of all desktops, servers, and mainframes with related locations and related facility descriptions such a space utilized and space available.
- 27. An inventory of all desktop, server, and mainframe software with related locations and users
- 28. A graphic depiction of the various data networks throughout the state
- 29. Complete data center physical descriptions and schematics of all equipment placement
- 30. Environmental descriptions of each data center (air conditioning, sprinkler systems, inc.)
- 31. Hardware and application inventories by data center.
- 32. Data center staffing / organizational charges
- 33. Customer list by data center, mapped to applications
- 34. A detailed list of all current hardware and non-application software configurations, by entity.
- 35. A current network configuration, including numbers of connections, protocols, and the like.
- 36. A list of each application hosted on each of the platforms, by entity.
- 37. Utilization data by "service" and user agency, by program within agency.
- 38. Detailed organization charts and staff listings of open and filled/unfilled positions (personnel counts will be included in the IT spreadsheet. Open and filled/unfilled information will also be collected.)
- 39. Copies of all existing performance measures/service level agreements or interagency agreements.
- 40. Detailed equipment inventory including number of desktops and servers supported.
- 41. Detailed software license agreements, by entity
- 42. Summaries of over/under-billed services for centers functioning as Internal Service Funds.

Additional Questions received at the October 28, 2003, Mandatory Vendors Conference:

<u>VC Question 1.)</u> "Who are the Sponsors for this study?" **Answer: This study was a recommendation from the Program Elimination Commission. Commission members include those**

Voting Members:

Bob Rafferty, Chairperson (appointed by Speaker of the House)

Senator Mike Connolly (appointed by Senate Minority Leader)

Diane Crookham-Johnson (appointed by Senate Majority Leader)

Mark Ketchum (appointed by the Legislative Council)

Virginia Petersen (appointed by the House Minority Leader)

Nonvoting Members:

Honorable Ralph F. McCartney (appointed by the Chief Justice of the Iowa Supreme Court)

Senator Neal Schuerer (appointed by the Legislative Council)

Arthur Small, Jr. (appointed by the Governor)

Staff Contacts:

P

Mollie K. Anderson, Director Patrick J. Deluhery, Chief Operating Officer

Doug Wulf, Division Administrator, Legislative Fiscal Bureau, (515) 281-3250

John Pollak, Committee Services Administrator, Legislative Service Bureau, (515) 281-3818

Patty Funaro, Senior Legal Counsel, Legislative Service Bureau, (515) 281-3040

<u>VC Question 2.)</u> Does this RFP include "ANALYSIS" of the IT Consolidation <u>and</u> "IMPLEMENTATION" of the IT Consolidation that will follow if my proposed "Scenario" is accepted? *Answer: No.*

<u>VC Question 3.)</u> If this RFP includes only the ANALYSIS of IT Consolidation, and my company is awarded RFP70400S027, will <u>my company</u> be precluded from bidding on any IMPLEMENTATION project that results from the acceptance of one of my "Scenario's"? Will <u>sub-contractors on my RFP70400S027 project team</u> be excluded from participating in any subsequent IMPLEMENTATION that results from the Legislature's acceptance of one of my "scenario's? *Answer: Your company and your sub-contractors will not be able to participate in the Implementation effort, as it would create an unacceptable conflict of interest.*

<u>VC Question 4.)</u> I do not want my company or sub-contractors on my RFP70400S027 project team to be excluded from any consolidation IMPLEMENTATION that results from the State's acceptance of my company's response to RFP70400S027 and/or proposed scenario. Will my RFP be rejected if I include itemized pricing for IMPLEMENTATION in each of my scenarios and specify in my RFP Response Package it is an <u>all-or none</u> proposal including analysis AND implementation of any scenario accepted by the Legislature? *Answer: Yes.*

<u>VC Question 5.)</u> Are any State Executive Branch agencies currently using <u>performance metrics</u> and if so, please list them. *Answer: Unknown*

V<u>C Question 6.)</u> Are any State Executive Branch agencies currently using performance metrics/disincentives and if so, please list them. *Answer: Unknown*

<u>VC Question 7.)</u> Will the <u>Baseline Information</u> and/or IT <u>Spreadsheets</u> be made available to assist us in developing our proposal response package? *Answer: No.*

<u>VC Question 8.</u>) Please provide an "anticipated date" on which a "Notice of Intent to Award" will be released for this project. *Answer: We anticipate an award can be made by mid December, no firm date is available.*

<u>VC Question 9.)</u> In the event the legislature approves funding for a specific "scenario", how soon after this approval do you anticipate the implementation project will begin? *Answer: The funding the Legislature is to approve is for "performing" the Consolidation Study. Following the Legislature's analysis of the Study a decision may be made as to what, if any, consolidation will be undertaken. Time frame for implementation is unknown.*

<u>VC Question 10.</u>) Please identify the specific legislator(s) who would introduce the funding bill for the project we propose in RFP70400S027? *Answer: Unknown.*

<u>VC Question 11.)</u> Please identify the specific legislators(s) who introduced House File 534 that mandated RFP70400S027. *Answer: The EIP Assessment, also known as the Consolidation Analysis Project, has its roots in recommendations from the Program Elimination Commission (PEC) that issued its report in the fall of 2002. The PEC completed its work during the 2002 Legislative Interim and is no longer an active commission. The PEC recommendations were folded into the DAS bill, HF-534, to require the*

Mollie K. Anderson, Director Patrick J. Deluhery, Chief Operating Officer

consolidation at a certain date. However, the provisions were amended to conduct a study, rather than require the consolidation, and make a report to the legislature. The amended language was adopted. Following is a member list from the now inactive PEC:

Voting Members:

Bob Rafferty, Chairperson (appointed by Speaker of the House)

Senator Mike Connolly (appointed by Senate Minority Leader)

Diane Crookham-Johnson (appointed by Senate Majority Leader)

Mark Ketchum (appointed by the Legislative Council)

Virginia Petersen (appointed by the House Minority Leader)

Nonvoting Members:

Honorable Ralph F. McCartney (appointed by the Chief Justice of the Iowa Supreme Court)

Senator Neal Schuerer (appointed by the Legislative Council)

Arthur Small, Jr. (appointed by the Governor)

Staff Contacts:

Doug Wulf, Division Administrator, Legislative Services Agency, (515) 281-3250

John Pollak, Committee Services Administrator, Legislative Services Agency, (515) 281-3818

Patty Funaro, Senior Legal Counsel, Legislative Services Agency, (515) 281-3040)

<u>VC Question 12.)</u> Please provide a definite list of each agency and department who MUST complete an IT Spreadsheet and confirm the agencies inclusion in the scope of this project. Please provide an additional list of each agency and department that MAY also complete an IT Spreadsheet. *Answer:* **See** *Attachment V.*

<u>VC Question 13.)</u> Please confirm an OPTIONAL pricing approach shall be considered to cover the optional participation of the Legislative and Judicial Branches. *Answer: Confirmed, Cost Proposals must include incremental pricing with the base cost being for the Executive Branch agencies (those that are mandatory organizations) and "add-on" costs for the optional organizations (such as the Judicial and Legislative Branches). See Attachment VI.*

<u>VC Question 14.)</u> Will the COST proposal forms be adjusted to reflect the OPTIONAL pricing approach. ...this assuring consistency across all vendor response packages. *Answer:* See Attachment VI.

<u>VC Question 15.</u>) Please confirm the number of scenarios that should be estimated in the Cost proposal forms. **Answer: At least three (3) scenarios must be submitted.**

<u>VC Question 16.</u>) Will the RFP70400S027 awarded vendor be required to assist in legislative presentations for obtaining the legislative funding? *Answer: Possibly.*

<u>VC Question 17.)</u> Will sub-contractors on my project team be precluded from responding to following procurements such as providing new consolidated computing platforms? *Answer: Yes, as it would create a conflict of interest. In other words, if the sub-contractors submit specifications that are accepted, and then want to bid on those same specifications, it would probably be deemed a conflict of interest and give a competitive advantage to the sub-contractors in future procurements.*



Mollie K. Anderson, Director Patrick J. Deluhery, Chief Operating Officer

<u>VC Question 18.)</u> IT Consolidation is mandatory for the Executive Branch but optional for Judicial and Legislative Branches. Should our technical and/or cost proposal assume all three (3) branches will be included or should our technical and/or cost proposal be structured as three separate modules (one for each branch) in each scenario? *Answer: It is mandatory that Executive Branch agencies participate in the IT Consolidation <u>Study.</u> The Consolidation effort, if any, has not been determined by the Legislature. (See also, answers to VC Question 13. and VC Question 14.)*

<u>VC Question 19.</u>) Regarding the Enterprise, Infrastructure and Personnel (EIP) Team, how many members are on this team and how many of these members are available full-time for this project? **Answer: A Project Manager** is assigned full-time to this project. **All other state employees are part-time to varying degrees.**

<u>VC Question 20.)</u> RFP 3.2, Section A., "and enterprise open systems/servers and desktops". Please clarify by NAMING all agencies/departments considered within the scope of enterprise open systems. *Answer: See Attachment V.*

<u>VC Question 21.</u>) Have you prioritized, or put any "weight" on any systems, processes or departments that have more significance/importance as it relates to this project? If so, please identify them. *Answer: No.*

<u>VC Question 22.)</u> Will the project be flexible as to my personnel who will be assigned to this project? *Answer: The State will follow the procedure described in RFP Section 3.1.C.2 and 3.1.D.3 and 3.1.E.2.*

<u>VC Question 23.)</u> Provide a list of the minimum (or maximum if it is available) specific baseline information that shall be provided. *Answer: This information is currently being developed from the high-level descriptions at RFP Section 3.2.A. Refer also to additional descriptions provided in the Glossary of Terms.*

<u>VC Question 24.</u>) May we include sub-contractors on our team who did not attend the vendor conference? **Answer: Yes, sub-contractors were not required to attend the Mandatory Vendors Conference.**

Please acknowledge receipt of Addendum No. 3., in your Technical Proposal Response Package.



Mollie K. Anderson, Director Patrick J. Deluhery, Chief Operating Officer

ATTACHMENT V

(2-Pages

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL NO. RFP70400S027

Addendum No. 3.

State of Iowa

Department of Administrative Services General Services Enterprise

LIST OF MANDATORY, OPTIONAL & EXCLUDED ORGANIZATIONS

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL NO. RFP70400S027

MANDATORY Organizations – Agencies in Executive Branch:

Administrative Services, Department of / Information Technology Enterprise

Blind, Department for the

Civil Rights

College Student Aid Commission

Commerce - Alcoholic Beverages

Commerce - Banking

Commerce - Credit Union

Commerce - Insurance

Commerce - Professional Licensing & Regulation

Commerce - Utilities

Corrections

Cultural Affairs

Economic Development

Education

Education - Library Services

Education - Vocational Rehabilitation

Elder Affairs

Ethics & Campaign Disclosure

Governor's Office

Governor's Office on Drug Control Policy

Human Rights

Human Services

Inspections & Appeals

Iowa Communications Network



Mollie K. Anderson, Director Patrick J. Deluhery, Chief Operating Officer

Iowa Finance Authority

Iowa Law Enforcement Academy

Iowa Public Employees Retirement System (IPERS)

Management

Natural Resources

Parole Board

Public Defense

Public Defense – Homeland Security/Emergency Management

Public Employment Relations Board

Public Health

Public Safety

Revenue

Transportation

Veterans Home

Workforce Development

OPTIONAL Organizations:

Agriculture & Land Stewardship

Auditor's Office

Education - Iowa Public Television

Judicial Branch

Justice (Attorney General)

Legislative Branch

Revenue - Iowa Lottery

Secretary of State

Treasurer's Office

EXCLUDED Organizations:

Board of Regents and associated institutions



Mollie K. Anderson, Director Patrick J. Deluhery, Chief Operating Officer

ATTACHMENT VI

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL NO. RFP70400S027

Addendum No. 3.

State of Iowa

Department of Administrative Services **General Services Enterprise**

COST PROPOSAL RESPONSE FORMS

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL NO. RFP70400S027

Submitted by:	
Firm Name:	
Address:	
City, State, Zip	
Telephone:	
Fax:	
E-Mail Address:	
Signed:	
Print Name:	
Title:	
Date:	

Continued on next page.



Mollie K. Anderson, Director Patrick J. Deluhery, Chief Operating Officer

itemized total cost" COST PROPOSAL

COST PROPOSAL Must be	dii-inclusive, itemized, ioidi cosi
Executive Branch	
(Mandatory participating agencies, Add lines as necess	
(ivialidatory participating agencies, 2 iau unes as necess	
Total Executive Branch (Mandatory agencies)	
Agriculture & Land Stewardship	
(Optional participation, Add lines as necessary)	
Total Agriculture & Land Stewardship	
Auditor's Office	
(Optional participation, Add lines as necessary)	
(<u> </u>	
Total Auditor's Office	
Education – Iowa Public Television	
(Optional participation, Add lines as necessary)	
Total Education – Iowa Public Television	
Judicial Branch	
(Optional participation, Add lines as necessary)	
Optional participation, 2 iau unes as necessary)	
Total Judicial Branch	
Justice (Attorney General)	
, ,	
(Optional participation, Add lines as necessary)	
Total Justice (Attorney General)	
Legislative Branch	
(Optional participation, Add lines as necessary)	
Total Legislative Branch	
Revenue – Iowa Lottery	
(Optional participation, Add lines as necessary)	
(
Total Revenue – Iowa Lottery	
Secretary of State	
(Optional participation, Add lines as necessary)	
(Sphonai participation, 2 iau unes us necessary)	
Total Secretary of State	
Treasurer's Office	
(Optional participation, Add lines as necessary)	
(Optional participation, Aud unes as necessary)	
H 1H 1 000	
Total Treasurer's Office	
TOTAL COST ALL COSTS	





General Services Enterprise

Mollie K. Anderson, Director Patrick J. Deluhery, Chief Operating Officer

BLANK SHEET END PAGE